

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed on July 9, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2007, claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 8 and 12 were rejected under **35 USC § 112** as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-7 were rejected under **35 USC § 102** as being unpatentable over Berstis (U.S. Patent 6,182,122, hereinafter Berstis) or, in the alternative under **35 USC § 103(a)** as obvious over Berstis, in view of Yates, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,438, hereinafter Yates).

Claim 8 was rejected under **35 USC § 103(a)** as obvious over Berstis, in view of Yates, and further in view of Martin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,867,706, hereinafter Martin).

Claims 9, 13, 15-16, and 19 were rejected under the Mozilla Organization - Mozilla 0.9.5 release notes 10/25/01 (hereinafter Mozilla) in view of Official Notice.

Claims 10-11, 17, and 20 were rejected under **35 USC § 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Mozilla as applied to claims 9 and 13, and further in view of Berstis.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response cancels Claims 3-5, 11-15, 18, and 20; amends Claims 1-2, 6, 8-10, 16-17, and 19; and adds new claims 21-33; leaving for the Examiner's consideration claims 1-2, 6-10, 16-17, 19, and 21-33. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any original presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2007, Claim 6 was objected to. Applicant has amended claim 6 as suggested to read “number of webpages”.

IV. Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2007, Claims 8 was rejected because the meaning of “the computer processor(s)” is unclear. The present response hereby amends Claim 8 to refer to “a processor within the user’s computer”.

Claim 12 was rejected because the meaning of “one or more hyperlink lists returned by a plurality of search engines” is unclear. The present response cancels Claim 12.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed July 9, 2007, Claims 1-7 were rejected under **35 USC § 102** as being unpatentable over Berstis or, in the alternative under **35 USC § 103(a)** as obvious over Berstis, in view of Yates.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and distinctly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *A method for retrieving and viewing webpages in a web browser operating on a user’s computer, comprising the sequential steps of:
submitting, from said web browser, a search request to a search engine located on the Internet;
receiving a rank-ordered hyperlink list from said search engine to form a queue of hyperlinks;
automatically loading a plurality of webpages referred to by said queue of hyperlinks to form a rank-ordered queue of webpages stored on the user’s computer; and
viewing said webpages in the web browser.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines a process that originates with a search request by a user. This request is most often a new request - that is, one that was not previously made by the user. Specifically, the process claimed by applicant requires the steps of:

- The user makes a search request to a search engine from a Web browser on their computer.
- The search engine returns a rank-ordered list of hyperlinks that refer to Webpages, some or all of these Webpages never having been previously viewed by the user.
- The IRDS function on the user's (client) computer uses this list of hyperlinks to preload Webpages corresponding to those hyperlinks, storing these Webpages on the user's computer in a sequential queue, ordered according to the ranking supplied by the search engine.
- The user may then instantly examine these preloaded Webpages, rather than following the normal search engine paradigm where each Webpage is loaded independently from its source as the user clicks each hyperlink.

Berstis teaches that users browse offline and receive Webpages from a pre-cache located on a server (col 4, lines 63-67). Webpages have been previously loaded into this pre-cache **according to historical information** including previously accessed Webpages as well as statistical and/or relationship criteria (Abstract). This creates an increased probability that the Webpage a user desires may be already available in the pre-cache such that it will not need to be retrieved from the Internet when specifically requested. Berstis addresses the problem that existed in the earlier days of the Internet when bandwidth and performance for retrieving Webpages was extremely limited. By providing a server containing pre-cached Webpages, if the desired Webpage was contained in the pre-cache, a user would see greatly and increased performance since the cached Webpage will be available to the user much faster than if it were to be freshly accessed from a source on the Internet. Berstis also teaches that a data processing unit (302) comprising part of a user unit (102-108) should be minimal and low cost, relying on the server for processing power and storage.

The process taught by Berstis is as follows:

- Pre-cache on server is loaded with Webpages based on historical information
- User requests a Webpage
- Is a Webpage pre-cached in server?
- If yes, transmit Webpage data from server to user computer.

It should be noted in this process that Berstis teaches that the user has requested a specific Webpage, and Berstis' invention then determines if the Webpage already exists in the pre-cache. As pointed out by the Examiner, Berstis does not disclose making a search request to an Internet search engine.

Yates teaches a distributed caching approach where cache servers are attached to routers at different points throughout the Internet such that when a user requests a document from some original source on the Internet, there is a probability that the document may already exist on one of these cache servers. Should the document already exist, it may be retrieved with greater speed compared with retrieving the document from the original source. As in Berstis, Yates invention attempts to mitigate a historical performance limitation of the Internet as it existed at the time of Yates invention. Specifically, the process described by Yates is:

- Documents/Webpages are pre-cached in cache servers attached to Internet routers based on historical information
- User requests a document/Webpage
- Is a document/Webpage pre-cached in a cache server along the routing path to the information source?
- If yes, transmit document/Webpage data from cache server to user.

Also, it was stated in the Office Action that Yates explicitly discloses "receiving a hyperlink list from a search engine" (col 4, ln 53-59). However, Applicant wishes to point out that in the referenced paragraph (col 4, ln 53-59), Yates describes the caching of "popular documents such as databases, search engine index files, and the like". Here,

Yates refers to “search engine index files” as a form of document, not a search engine functionality that returns a rank-ordered queue of hyperlinks in response to a search request, enabling a Web browser on a user’s computer to pre-load Webpages referred to by the queue of hyperlinks, as required by Applicant’s Claim 1. In fact, it is well known in the art that search engine index files are simply documents that are used by search engines during their operation.

Applicant respectfully submits that Berstis, or Berstis in combination with Yates fail to disclose the features of Claim 1 as amended.

Firstly, the cited references fail to disclose that Webpages are preloaded and queued according to hyperlinks returned by a search engine as a result of a new search by a particular user. For both Berstis and Yates, documents or Webpages are cached based on historical and statistical information related to the users that have access to the cache. Applicant’s invention is focused on the results of specific new searches executed by **one specific user**. Berstis and Yates disclose caches where alterations to a cache are a result of previous actions by **all users**. Applicant also wishes to point out that for Applicant’s invention, each search request to a search engine (as well known in the art) is independent of any historical activity by the particular user making the search request.

Secondly, the cited references fail to disclose that Webpages are stored on the user’s computer. Both Berstis and Yates teach that Webpages are cached on servers that are separate from the user’s computer. Applicant’s Claim 1 requires that Webpages are stored on a specific user’s computer.

Thirdly, Berstis and Yates disclose cache mechanisms as opposed to the queue mechanism disclosed by Applicant. A cache as disclosed by Berstis and Yates, and also well known in the art, is modified according to historical activity. In the case of Berstis and Yates, this includes statistical and associative analysis which are also historical by nature. Applicant discloses receiving a rank-ordered hyperlink list resulting from a new search request to an Internet search engine, where it is well known in the art that each

new search made to a search engine does not rely on any previous search activity by the particular user. As Applicant has already pointed out (Published Application No 2004/0049541 , para 0019, lines 30-32), “It is unnecessary to further apply a probabilistic or statistical user model to said Web page containing said hyperlink list, as the hyperlink list is already ranked ordered.” Basically, a hyperlink list returned to a user according to Applicant’s invention is already in a prioritized order and effectively forms a **queue** - as opposed to a cache. The cache mechanisms disclosed by Berstis and Yates can be interpreted consistent with the generally understood industry definition (Source: Wikipedia) of “In computer science, a **cache** is a collection of data duplicating original values stored elsewhere or computed earlier, where the original data is expensive to fetch (due to longer access time) or to compute, compared to the cost of reading the cache.” In contrast to a cache, Applicant’s invention discloses a queue that is freshly generated according to a specific search by a user and is pre-ranked by the search engine.

In general, the purpose of Applicant’s invention differs considerably from Berstis and Yates. While Berstis and Yates have devised methods to mitigate the performance problems associated with the early years of the Internet, Applicant has devised methods to use the ever expanding power and performance of the personal computer and the Internet to provide the user with more information and in a more convenient way.

Claim 9

Claim 9 has been amended to more clearly and distinctly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 9 defines:

9. *A method of displaying webpages in a web browser operating on a user’s computer, including:*

displaying a plurality of fully functional webpages in a single web browser at the same time such that all of said plurality of fully functional webpages are simultaneously visible to the user.

As amended, Claim 9 defines a method for providing the user of a Web browser with more simultaneous information than was theretofore available to them. Applicant accomplishes this by modifying a single Web browser to effectively view and operate on multiple Webpages simultaneously, based on a queue of hyperlinks returned by a search engine. As described, Applicant's invention is capable of dividing the browser window into multiple segments, each segment displaying a **fully functional** Webpage - not a thumbnail image or a tab. A fully functional page shows all images and text visible within the scrollable viewing area, and all visible hypertext is active and accessible to the user.

Mozilla 0.9.5 Release Notes disclose a Web browser containing a tabbed browsing functionality. Mozilla.org maintains an archive of past software releases including the browser version 0.9.5 referenced in the Office Action. Since the referenced release notes do not specifically describe the operation of "tabbed browsing" as implemented in Mozilla version 0.9.5, Applicant installed this software release on a PC in order to determine the true functionality of the referenced version. Applicant discovered that the referenced functionality operates in a manner similar to tabbed browsing as implemented in the most recent releases of Mozilla (now FireFox) as well as Microsoft Internet Explorer - the most popular and familiar Web browser. Essentially, a tabbed browser as observed in all of these implementations enables the user to have multiple browser instances contained in a single browser window. Before the availability of tabbed browsers, to maintain one stream of "browsing" while initiating or continuing with another separate stream of browsing, a user would have to start or switch to an additional browser instance. It was not uncommon for users to have 12 or more browser instances running simultaneously - each instance requiring additional system memory and overhead resources. Tabbed browsing enables a single browser instance to support multiple, independent streams of browsing, without the additional overhead. Unfortunately, as implemented, only one browser display from one browser stream can be displayed at a time. Thus, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in Office Action Item No. 19 that "tabbed browsing comprises displaying a plurality of fully functional Webpages in a single Web browser at the same time". While a plurality of "tabs" are displayed, a

plurality of actual “webpages” is never displayed. In contrast to Mozilla, Applicant’s invention provides a display of multiple Webpages (from a single browser stream of activity) in a single browser window. This is in contrast to Mozilla where multiple browser activity streams are supported in a single window but only one can be observed at a time. Hence, Mozilla, or Mozilla in combination with “Official Notice” does not teach or demonstrate the functionality described by Applicant.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 16-17, and 19

Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 16-17, and 19 are not addresses separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 16-17, and 19 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Additional Amendment

The present Response hereby adds new claims 21-33. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21-33 are allowable over the cited references and consideration thereof is respectfully requested. Applicant will specifically discuss new independent claims 22 and 30 below.

Claim 22

As added, independent Claim 22 defines:

22. *A method for retrieving and viewing webpages in a single web browser operating on a user’s computer, comprising the sequential steps of:*

· submitting, from said single web browser, a search request to a search engine located on the Internet;
receiving a rank-ordered hyperlink list from said search engine;
automatically loading a plurality of webpages referred to by said hyperlink list to form a rank-ordered queue of webpages stored on the user's computer; and
viewing said webpages in said single web browser such that a plurality of fully functional webpages are displayed in said single web browser at the same time.

Claim 22 combines embodiments similar to those described in Claims 1 and 9. While independently patentable, Claim 22 recites limitations that, similar to those described above with respect to Claims 1 and 9, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Consideration of Claim 22 and new dependent claims 23-29 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 30

As added, independent Claim 30 defines:

30. *A method for retrieving and viewing webpages in a single web browser operating on a user's computer, comprising the sequential steps of:*
simultaneously submitting, from said web browser, a search request to multiple search engines located on the Internet;
receiving a rank-ordered hyperlink list from each of said multiple search engines;
automatically forming a single queue of hyperlinks from all hyperlink lists received;
automatically loading a plurality of webpages referred to by said single queue of hyperlinks to form a queue of webpages stored on the user's computer;
and
viewing said webpages in the web browser.

As submitted, Claim 30 defines a process that originates with a search request by a user that is sent to multiple search engines. Specifically, the process claimed by applicant requires the steps of:

- The user makes a search request that is sent from the Web browser on their computer to multiple search engines.
- Each search engine returns a rank-ordered list of hyperlinks that refer to Webpages, some or all of these Webpages never having been previously viewed by the user.
- The IRDS function on the user's computer operates on these multiple rank-ordered lists of hyperlinks, and merges them to form a single hyperlink list, removing duplicate links in the process.
- The IRDS function on the user's computer uses this list of hyperlinks to preload Webpages corresponding to those hyperlinks, storing these Webpages on the user's computer in a sequential queue.
- The user may then instantly examine these preloaded Webpages, rather than following the normal search engine paradigm where each Webpage is loaded independently from its source as the user clicks each hyperlink. Because the user receives results from multiple search engines, they experience a greater probability of accessing information that is more relevant to their search.

Consideration of Claim 30 and new dependent Claims 31-33 is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.
